

DECOMPOSABILITY OF MULTIVARIABLE POLYNOMIALS¹

CONSTANTIN N. BELI

If K is an algebraically closed field, $n \geq 1$ and $K[X] = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ we determine all finite nonempty sets $I \subset \mathbb{N}_0^n$ such that every $P \in K[X]$ of the form $P = \sum_{i \in I} a_i X^i$ with $a_i \in K^* \forall i \in I$ is decomposable. We also consider the problem of finding all sets I such that every $P = \sum_{i \in I} a_i X^i$ with $a_i \in K^*$ is irreducible and how the answer to this problem depends on the characteristic.

1. MAIN THEOREM, THE FIRST IMPLICATION

Let K be an algebraically closed field and let $n \geq 1$. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be variables. We denote $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $K[X] = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$. If $i = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ we denote $X^i = X_1^{i_1} \dots X_n^{i_n}$.

For any $P \in K[X]$ we denote by $I(P) \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ the support of P , which is the finite set for which P can be written as $P = \sum_{i \in I(P)} a_i X^i$ with $a_i \in K^*$. (We make the convention that $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}_0$, the set of all non-negative integers.)

Various mathematicians have produced irreducibility criteria in terms of $I(P)$ only. Most of these results are consequences of the following principle. If $X_t \nmid P \forall t$ and the Newton polytope of P , $C(P) := \text{conv } I(P)$ cannot be written as a Minkowski sum $C(P) = C' + C''$, where C', C'' are convex polytopes of positive dimensions with vertices in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ then P is irreducible. However this is not the most general result possible and the problem of finding *all* finite nonempty sets $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ such that any $P \in K[X]$ with $I(P) = I$ is irreducible is very unlikely to have a simple solution. In this paper we consider the opposite problem of determining all sets I such that every $P \in K[X]$ with $I(P) = I$ is decomposable. In our main result, Theorem 1.3, we prove that this happens in only three trivial cases.

¹I INTEND TO PUBLISH THIS PAPER BUT FIRST I WANT TO BE 100% SURE IT IS ORIGINAL. IF ANY READER IS AWARE OF ANY RESULTS RESEMBLING THEOREMS 1.3, 4.1, 4.2 OR LEMMA 3.4 THEN PLEASE LET ME KNOW. THANK YOU.

For any finite non-empty $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ we define $V_I = V_I(K)$ and $Z_I = Z_I(K)$:

$$V_I := \{P \in K[X] \mid I(P) = I\} \text{ and } Z_I := \{P \in V_I \mid P \text{ is reducible}\}.$$

We have $V_I \equiv (K^*)^{|I|}$, which is an affine variety over K . We will prove that Z_I is a subvariety in V_I and we give necessary and sufficient conditions such that $Z_I = V_I$. Obviously if $n = 1$, when every polynomial of degree ≥ 2 is reducible, we have $V_I = Z_I$ iff $I \not\subseteq \{0, 1\}$. When $n \geq 2$ the conditions are much more restrictive.

We also define:

$$W_I = W_I(K) := \{P \in K[X] \mid P \neq 0, I(P) \subseteq I\}.$$

We have $W_I \cong \mathbb{A}^{|I|} \setminus \{0\}$ so $W_I/K^* \cong \mathbb{P}^{|I|-1}$.

For any $P, Q \in K[X]$ we have $I(PQ) \subseteq I(P) + I(Q)$. Hence if $I' + I'' \subseteq I$ the mapping $(P, Q) \mapsto PQ$ defines a morphism of quasi-projective varieties $\mu_{I', I''} : W_{I'} \times W_{I''} \rightarrow W_I$. It induces a morphism of projective varieties $\bar{\mu}_{I', I''} : W_{I'}/K^* \times W_{I''}/K^* \rightarrow W_I/K^*$.

On $V_I, W_I, W_I/K^*$ we consider the Zariski topology. Then V_I is open in W_I . Also if $I \subseteq J$ then W_I is closed in W_J and, moreover, W_I is the closure of V_I in W_J .

Lemma 1.1. *The image of $\mu_{I', I''} : W_{I'} \times W_{I''} \rightarrow W_I$ is closed in W_I .*

Proof. Since $\bar{\mu}_{I', I''} : W_{I'}/K^* \times W_{I''}/K^* \rightarrow W_I/K^*$ is a morphism of projective varieties $\text{Im } \bar{\mu}_{I', I''}$ is closed in W_I/K^* . But the canonical projection $\pi_I : W_I \rightarrow W_I/K^*$ is continuous and $\text{Im } \mu_{I', I''} = \pi_I^{-1}(\text{Im } \bar{\mu}_{I', I''})$ so $\text{Im } \mu_{I', I''}$ is closed in W_I . $\square$

Proposition 1.2. *Z_I is closed in V_I .*

Proof. If $i = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ we denote $\sum i := i_1 + \dots + i_n$. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $I_d = \{i \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid \sum i \leq d\}$. Then $W_{I_d} = \{P \in K[X] \mid P \neq 0, \deg P \leq d\}$.

Let $d = \max\{\sum i \mid i \in I\}$. Then $\deg P = d$ for any $P \in V_I$. We may assume that $d \geq 2$ since otherwise $Z_I = \emptyset$. Now if $P \in V_I$ we have $P \in Z_I$ iff $P = QR$ for some $Q, R \in K[X]$ of degree $\leq d-1$, i.e. iff P is in the image of $\mu_{I_{d-1}, I_{d-1}} : W_{I_{d-1}} \times W_{I_{d-1}} \rightarrow W_{I_{2d-2}}$. Hence $Z_I = V_I \cap \text{Im } \mu_{I_{d-1}, I_{d-1}}$. But by Lemma 1.1 $\text{Im } \mu_{I_{d-1}, I_{d-1}}$ is closed in $W_{I_{2d-2}}$ so Z_I is closed in V_I . $\square$

Let $e_1, \dots, e_n$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$, $e_t = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ be finite and nonempty. Then $Z_i = V_I$ if and only if one of the following holds.*

- (i) $I \subset e_t + \mathbb{N}^n$ and $I \neq \{e_t\}$ for some t .
- (ii) There are $i = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ and $j = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ with $i_t j_t = 0 \forall t$ and $\gcd\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\} > 1$ such that $i, j \in I \subset [i, j] := \{(1 - \lambda)i + \lambda j \mid 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1\}$.
- (iii) $\text{char } K = p$ and $\{0\} \neq I \subset p\mathbb{N}^n$ for some prime p .

Proof of “if”.

Let $P \in V_I$, $P = \sum_{i \in I} a_i X^i$. We consider the three cases.

(i) The condition that $I \subset e_t + \mathbb{N}^n$ means $X_t \mid P$ and the condition $I \neq \{e_t\}$ means that P is not of the form aX_t . Hence P is decomposable.

(ii) Let $\gcd\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\} = d \geq 2$. Since $i_t j_t = 0 \forall t$ we have $d = \gcd\{j_1 - i_1, \dots, j_n - i_n\}$. So an element $k = i + \lambda(j - i) \in [i, j]$, with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, will belong to $\mathbb{Z}^n$ iff $\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{d}$ for some integer $0 \leq \alpha \leq d$. So $I \subseteq [i, j] \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \{i + \frac{\alpha}{d}(j - i) \mid 0 \leq \alpha \leq d\}$. Hence

$$P = \sum_{\alpha=0}^d a_{\frac{d-\alpha}{d}i + \frac{\alpha}{d}j} X^{\frac{d-\alpha}{d}i + \frac{\alpha}{d}j} = \overline{P}(X^{\frac{1}{d}i} X^{\frac{1}{d}j}),$$

where

$$\overline{P}(Y, Z) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^d a_{\frac{d-\alpha}{d}i + \frac{\alpha}{d}j} Y^{d-\alpha} Z^{\alpha}.$$

Note that $a_{\frac{d-\alpha}{d}i + \frac{\alpha}{d}j}$ may be 0 for some $0 < \alpha < d$ but not for $\alpha = 0, d$ since $i, j \in I = I(P)$. Hence $\overline{P} \in K[Y, Z]$ is a homogenous polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$ not divisible by Y or Z . Since K is algebraically closed $\overline{P}$ decomposes as $\overline{P} = \overline{Q} \overline{R}$ where $\overline{Q}, \overline{R} \in K[Y, Z]$ are homogenous of degrees $d', d'' \geq 1$ with $d' + d'' = d$. So $P = QR$ with $Q = \overline{Q}(X^{\frac{1}{d}i} X^{\frac{1}{d}j})$, $R = \overline{R}(X^{\frac{1}{d}i} X^{\frac{1}{d}j})$. Since $\overline{Q}, \overline{R}$ are not divisible by Y or Z we have $|I(\overline{Q})|, |I(\overline{R})| \geq 2$. Since $i \neq j$ we have $X^{\frac{d'-\alpha}{d'}i + \frac{\alpha}{d'}j} \neq X^{\frac{d'-\beta}{d'}i + \frac{\beta}{d'}j}$ whenever $\alpha \neq \beta$. Hence $|I(Q)| = |I(\overline{Q})| \geq 2$ so Q is not a constant. Same for R so P is decomposable.

(iii) Since $I \subset p\mathbb{N}^n$ and $\text{char } K = p$ we have $P = Q^p$, where $Q = \sum_{i \in I} a_i^{\frac{1}{p}} X^{\frac{1}{p}i}$. But $I \neq \{0\}$ so Q is not a constant so P is decomposable. $\square$

2. MINKOWSKI SUMS AND NEWTON POLYTOPES

In this section we give some results on Minkowski sums of convex polytopes and Newton polytopes which are not essentially new. With different notations they can be found, say, in [G]. For the sake of self-containment we include the proofs.

We denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the usual inner product.

If $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ then we denote by $\text{conv } X$ its convex hull. If $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $X+Y$ their Minkowski sum, $X+Y := \{x+y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}$. Also if $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ then $X+y := X + \{y\} = \{x+y \mid x \in X\}$.

Given $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote $\langle X, a \rangle := \{\langle x, a \rangle \mid x \in X\}$. Assuming that $\min \langle X, a \rangle$ exists we denote

$$X_a := \{x \in X \mid \langle x, a \rangle = \min \langle X, a \rangle\}.$$

Throughout this section all subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ will be either finite sets or polytopes so $\min \langle X, a \rangle$ will always exists so X_a is always defined.

2.1. Note that for any $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\min \langle X+Y, a \rangle = \min \langle X, a \rangle + \min \langle Y, a \rangle$ and $(X+Y)_a = X_a + Y_a$. Also if $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ and $x+y \in (X+Y)_a$ then $x \in X_a$, $y \in Y_a$.

Similarly if $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ then $\min \langle X+y, a \rangle = \min \langle X, a \rangle + \langle y, a \rangle$ and $(X+y)_a = X_a + y$.

Any element $x \in \text{conv } X$ can be written as $x = \sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_t x_t$, where $x_t \in X$, $\lambda_t > 0$ and $\sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_t = 1$. We have $\langle x, a \rangle = \sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_t \langle x_t, a \rangle \geq \sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_t \min \langle X, a \rangle = \min \langle X, a \rangle$, with equality iff $x_t \in X_a \forall t$. Thus $\min \langle \text{conv } X, a \rangle = \min \langle X, a \rangle$ and $(\text{conv } X)_a = \text{conv } X_a$.

Let C be a polytope. We have $C = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}(C)$, where $\mathcal{V}(C)$ is the set of vertices. We denote by $\mathcal{F}(C)$ the set of all faces of C . If $\dim C = m$ then $\mathcal{F}(C) = \bigcup_{t=0}^m \mathcal{F}_t(C)$, where $\mathcal{F}_t(C)$ is the set of faces of dimension t . We have $\mathcal{F}_0(C) = \{\{v\} \mid v \in \mathcal{V}(C)\}$, $\mathcal{F}_1(C)$ is the set of edges and $\mathcal{F}_m(C) = \{C\}$.

The faces of C are the subsets of C where a linear function $x \mapsto \langle x, a \rangle$ reaches its minimum (or maximum). So every $D \in \mathcal{F}(C)$ can be written as $D = C_a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let now C', C'' be two convex polytopes and let $C = C' + C''$. For convenience we put $\mathcal{V}(C) = \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{F}(C) = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}_t(C) = \mathcal{F}_t$. Similarly we define $\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{V}'', \mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}''$ and $\mathcal{F}'_t, \mathcal{F}''_t$, corresponding to C', C'' .

Definition 1. For any $D \in \mathcal{F}$ we define

$$\Phi(D) = \{x \in C' \mid \exists y \in C'', x+y \in D\}$$

$$\Psi(D) = \{y \in C'' \mid \exists x \in C', x+y \in D\}.$$

Since Φ, Ψ depend on C', C'' we denote them by $\Phi_{C', C''}, \Psi_{C', C''}$.

Note that by definition if $D, D' \in \mathcal{F}$ and $D' \subseteq D$ then $\Phi(D') \subseteq \Phi(D)$ and $\Psi(D') \subseteq \Psi(D)$.

Lemma 2.2. If $D = C_a$ then $\Phi(D) = C'_a$ and $\Psi(D) = C''_a$.

Proof. If $x \in C'_a$ then for any $y \in C''_a$ we have $x + y \in C'_a + C''_a = C_a = D$ so $x \in \Phi(D)$. Conversely, if $x \in \Phi(D)$ then there is $y \in C''$ with $x + y \in D$. We have $x \in C'$, $y \in C''$ and $x + y \in D = C_a$ so $x \in C'_a$, $y \in C''_a$. Hence $\Phi(D) = C'_a$. similarly $\Psi(D) = C''_a$. $\square$

Corollary 2.3. (i) The mappings $D \mapsto \Phi(D)$, $D \mapsto \Psi(D)$ define surjective functions $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ and $\Psi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''$.

(ii) For any $D \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $\Phi(D) + \Psi(D) = D$. For any $x \in C'$, $y \in C''$ we have $x + y \in D$ iff $x \in \Phi(D)$, $y \in \Psi(D)$.

Proof. (i) By Lemma 2.3 every $\Phi(D)$ is of the form C'_a for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so it belongs to $\mathcal{F}'$. The function $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ is surjective because for every $D' \in \mathcal{F}'$ there is some $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $D' = C'_a = \phi(C_a)$. Similarly for Ψ .

(ii) follows from the fact that $C' + C'' = C$ and $D = C_a$, $\Phi(D) = C'_a$ and $\Psi(D) = C''_a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. $\square$

For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ we have $\{v\} \in \mathcal{F}$. From $\{v\} = \Phi(\{v\}) + \Psi(\{v\})$ we get that $\Phi(\{v\}) \in \mathcal{F}'$ and $\Psi(\{v\}) \in \mathcal{F}''$ are singeltons. Hence $\Phi(\{v\}) = \{v'\}$ and $\Psi(\{v\}) = \{v''\}$ for some $v' \in \mathcal{V}'$, $v'' \in \mathcal{V}''$. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 2. We define $\phi = \phi_{C', C''} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ and $\psi = \psi_{C', C''} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}''$ by

$$\{\phi(v)\} = \Phi(\{v\}) \text{ and } \{\psi(v)\} = \Psi(\{v\}) \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Note that $\Psi_{C', C''} = \Phi_{C'', C'}$ and $\psi_{C', C''} = \phi_{C'', C'}$.

Lemma 2.4. (i) ϕ and ψ are surjective.

(ii) If $v \in \mathcal{V}$ then $\phi(v) + \psi(v) = v$. Moreover, if $x \in C'$, $y \in C''$ and $x + y = v$ then $x = \phi(v)$, $y = \psi(v)$.

(iii) If $D \in \mathcal{F}$, $D' = \Phi(D)$ and $D'' = \Psi(D)$ then $\phi_{D', D''} = \phi|_{\mathcal{V}(D)}$ and $\psi_{D', D''} = \psi|_{\mathcal{V}(D)}$. Also $\phi(\mathcal{V}(D)) = \mathcal{V}(D')$ and $\psi(\mathcal{V}(D)) = \mathcal{V}(D'')$.

Proof. (i) Let $v' \in \mathcal{V}'$. Then $\{v'\} \in \mathcal{F}'$ so by Corollary 2.3(i) there is $D \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\Phi(D) = \{v'\}$. Let $v \in \mathcal{V}(D)$. Then $\{v\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\{v\} \subseteq D$ so $\Phi(\{v\}) \subseteq \Phi(D) = \{v'\}$. It follows that $\Phi(\{v\}) = \{v'\}$ so $v' = \phi(v)$. Thus ϕ is surjective. Similarly for ψ .

(ii) By Corollary 2.3(ii) we have $\{\phi(v)\} + \{\psi(v)\} = \Phi(\{v\}) + \Psi(\{v\}) = \{v\}$ so $\phi(v) + \psi(v) = v$. For the second claim note that $x + y = v$ may also be written as $x + y \in \{v\}$. Since $x \in C'$, $y \in C''$ this implies by Definition 1 that $x \in \Phi(\{v\}) = \{\phi(v)\}$, $y \in \Psi(\{v\}) = \{\psi(v)\}$.

(iii) We have $D' + D'' = D$ so we have the surjections $\phi' := \phi_{D', D''} : \mathcal{V}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(D')$ and $\psi' := \psi_{D', D''} : \mathcal{V}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(D'')$. If $v \in \mathcal{V}(D)$ by

(ii) $\phi'(v) + \psi'(v) = v$. But we have $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $\phi'(v) \in C'$ and $\psi'(v) \in C''$ so, again by (ii), $\phi'(v) = \phi(v)$ and $\psi'(v) = \psi(v)$. So $\phi' = \phi|_{\mathcal{V}(D)}$ and $\psi' = \psi|_{\mathcal{V}(D)}$. Hence $\phi(\mathcal{V}(D)) = \text{Im } \phi'$, which by the surjectivity of ϕ' , equals $\mathcal{V}(D')$. Similarly $\psi(\mathcal{V}(D)) = \mathcal{V}(D'')$. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. (i) If $D \in \mathcal{F}$ then $D = \Phi(D) + \Psi(D)$ is the only way of writing D as $D = X + Y$, with X, Y convex sets, $X \subseteq C'$, $Y \subseteq C''$.

(ii) If $D \in \mathcal{F}$, $D' = \Phi(D)$ and $D'' = \Psi(D)$ then $\Phi_{D', D''} = \Phi|_{\mathcal{F}(D)}$ and $\Psi_{D', D''} = \Psi|_{\mathcal{F}(D)}$.

Proof.(i) Let $X \subseteq C'$, $Y \subseteq C''$ be convex sets such that $X + Y = C$. Then $\forall x \in X \forall y \in Y$ we have $x \in C'$, $y \in C''$ and $x + y \in X + Y = D$. Thus $x \in \Phi(D)$, $y \in \Psi(D)$ by Definition 1. So $X \subseteq \Phi(D)$, $Y \subseteq \Psi(D)$. For the reverse inclusions let $D' = \Phi(D)$, $D'' = \Psi(D)$. Since $D' = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}(D')$, $D'' = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}(D'')$ and X, Y are convex it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{V}(D') \subseteq X$, $\mathcal{V}(D'') \subseteq Y$. But for any $v \in \mathcal{V}(D)$ we have $v \in D = X + Y$ so $v = x + y$ with $x \in X$, $y \in Y$. Since $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $x \in X \subseteq C'$ and $y \in Y \subseteq C''$ we get $x = \phi(v)$, $y = \psi(v)$ by Lemma 2.4 (ii). Hence $\phi(v) \in X$, $\psi(v) \in Y \forall v \in \mathcal{V}(D)$. It follows that $\mathcal{V}(D') = \phi(\mathcal{V}(D)) \subseteq X$ and $\mathcal{V}(D'') = \psi(\mathcal{V}(D)) \subseteq Y$. (See Lemma 2.4(iii).)

(ii) Since $D = D' + D''$ we have $\Phi' := \Phi_{D', D''} : \mathcal{F}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(D')$ and $\Psi' := \Psi_{D', D''} : \mathcal{F}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(D'')$. If $E \in \mathcal{F}(D)$ then $\psi'(E) \subseteq D' \subseteq C'$ and $\psi'(E) \subseteq D'' \subseteq C''$ are convex and $E = \Phi'(E) + \Psi'(E)$. Thus $\Phi'(E) = \Phi(E)$ and $\Psi'(E) = \Psi(E)$ by (i). $\square$

Lemma 2.6. (i) For any $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ there is $0 \leq \lambda_{[v, w]} \leq 1$ such that $\phi(w) - \phi(v) = \lambda_{[v, w]}(w - v)$ and $\psi(w) - \psi(v) = (1 - \lambda_{[v, w]})(w - v)$.

(ii) For any $[v_1, v_2], \dots, [v_{N-1}, v_N], [v_N, v_1] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ we have $\lambda_{[v_1, v_2]}(v_2 - v_1) + \dots + \lambda_{[v_{N-1}, v_N]}(v_N - v_{N-1}) + \lambda_{[v_N, v_1]}(v_1 - v_N) = 0$.

Proof.(i) Let $D = [v, w]$. Since $\mathcal{V}(D) = \{v, w\}$ we have by Lemma 2.4(iii) $\mathcal{V}(\Phi(D)) = \{\phi(v), \phi(w)\}$ so $\Phi(D) = [\phi(v), \phi(w)]$. (Note that we may have $\phi(v) = \phi(w)$, in which case $[\phi(v), \phi(w)]$ is a singleton.) Similarly $\Psi(D) = [\psi(v), \psi(w)]$. By Lemma 2.3(ii) we have $[\phi(v), \phi(w)] + [\psi(v), \psi(w)] = [v, w]$. In particular, $\phi(w) + \psi(v) \in [v, w]$. But $\phi(v) + \psi(v) = v$ so $\phi(w) + \psi(v) = v + \phi(w) - \phi(v)$. It follows that $v + \phi(w) - \phi(v) = v + \lambda(w - v)$, i.e. $\phi(w) - \phi(v) = \lambda(w - v)$ for some $\lambda = \lambda_{v, w}$, $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Since also $(\phi(w) - \phi(v)) + (\psi(w) - \psi(v)) = w - v$ we get also $\psi(w) - \psi(v) = (1 - \lambda)(w - v)$. Obviously $\lambda_{v, w} = \lambda_{w, v}$ so in fact $\lambda = \lambda_{[v, w]}$.

(ii) Follows trivially from (i). $\square$

Proposition 2.7. (i) The polytopes C', C'' with $C' + C'' = C$ are uniquely determined up to translations by the coefficients $\lambda_{[v,w]}$ defined in Lemma 2.6.

(ii) If $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ then $\lambda_{[v,w]} = \lambda$ for all $[v,w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ iff $C' = \lambda C + \beta$ and $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C - \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(iii) C' is a singleton iff all $\lambda_{[v,w]}$ are 0. C'' is a singleton iff all $\lambda_{[v,w]}$ are 1.

Proof.(i) Let $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}$ and let $\phi(v_0) = \alpha$. For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ there is a path of edges going from v_0 to v , i.e. there are $v_1, \dots, v_N = v$ such that $[v_{s-1}, v_s] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ for $1 \leq s \leq N$. By Lemma 2.6(i) we have $\phi(v) = \alpha + \sum_{s=1}^N (\phi(v_s) - \phi(v_{s-1})) = \alpha + \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_{[v_{s-1}, v_s]}(v_s - v_{s-1})$. Also $\psi(v) = v - \phi(v)$. Now $C' = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}' = \text{conv Im } \phi$ and $C'' = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}'' = \text{conv Im } \psi$. Hence C', C'' are uniquely determined by α and $\lambda_{[v,w]}$. If α is replaced by $\alpha' = \alpha + \beta$ then ϕ, ψ will be replaced by ϕ', ψ' with $\phi'(v) = \phi(v) + \beta$ and $\psi'(v) = \psi(v) - \beta$. Thus C' and C'' will be replaced by $C'_1 = C' + \beta$ and $C''_1 = C'' - \beta$.

(ii) If $C' = \lambda C$, $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C$ then $C = C' + C''$ follows from the convexity of C . If $v \in \mathcal{V}$ then $v = \lambda v + (1 - \lambda)v$ and $\lambda v \in C'$, $(1 - \lambda)v \in C''$ so $\phi(v) = \lambda v$, $\psi(v) = (1 - \lambda)v$ by Lemma 2.4(ii). If $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ then $\lambda_{[v,w]}(w - v) = \phi(w) - \phi(v) = \lambda w - \lambda v$ so $\lambda_{[v,w]} = \lambda$. By (i) all other decompositions $C = C' + C''$ with $\lambda_{[v,w]} = \lambda \forall [v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ are with $C' = \lambda C + \beta$, $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C - \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(iii) follows from (i) with $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$. $\square$

Corollary 2.8. If C is a triangle then the only decompositions $C = C' + C''$ are of the form $C' = \lambda C + \beta$, $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C - \beta$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{u, v, w\}$. By Proposition 2.7 we have to prove that $\lambda_{[u,v]} = \lambda_{[v,w]} = \lambda_{[w,u]}$. But this follows from $0 = \lambda_{[u,v]}(v - u) + \lambda_{[v,w]}(w - v) + \lambda_{[w,u]}(u - w) = (\lambda_{[u,v]} - \lambda_{[w,u]})(v - u) + (\lambda_{[v,w]} - \lambda_{[w,u]})(w - v)$. $\square$

2.9. Remarks The condition (ii) of Lemma 2.6 is equivalent to the apparently weaker statement that $\lambda_{[v_1, v_2]}v_2 - v_1 + \dots + \lambda_{[v_{N-1}, v_N]}(v_N - v_{N-1}) + \lambda_{[v_N, v_1]}(v_1 - v_N) = 0$ whenever $v_1, \dots, v_N$ are the vertices of a 2-dimensional (polygonal) face of C .

Proposition 2.7 gives only a unicity statement. In fact we also have existence. Namely the following result holds.

Theorem 2.10. ³ *Let C be a polytope. Let $\lambda_{[v,w]} \in [0, 1]$ for $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ with $\lambda_{[v_1,v_2]}(v_2 - v_1) + \dots + \lambda_{[v_{N-1},v_N]}(v_N - v_{N-1}) + \lambda_{[v_N,v_1]}(v_1 - v_N) = 0$ whenever $[v_1, \dots, v_N] \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Then there is a decomposition $C = C' + C''$ such that $\phi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ and $\psi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}''$ satisfy $\phi(w) - \phi(v) = \lambda_{[v,w]}(w - v)$ and $\psi(w) - \psi(v) = (1 - \lambda_{[v,w]})(w - v)$ for all $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$. C', C'' are unique up to translations.*

We don't need this result so we won't prove it here.

Definition 3. *On $\mathbb{R}^n$ we introduce the partial order relation $\leq$ given by $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ if $x_t \leq y_t \forall t$. For any bounded bellow set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\inf X$ its infimum.*

We have $\inf X = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$, where $i_t = \inf\{x_t \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X\}$.

Note that if X is finite or a polytope we have in fact $\inf X = (\min\langle X, e_1 \rangle, \dots, \min\langle X, e_n \rangle)$. It follows that $\inf(X + Y) = \inf X + \inf Y$ and if $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ then $\inf(X + y) = \inf X + y$. Also $\inf \text{conv } X = \inf X$.

Note that the condition $\inf X \geq 0$ is equivalent to $X \subseteq [0, \infty)^n$.

2.11. Remark If $\inf C = 0$ and we ask the condition that $C', C'' \subseteq [0, \infty)^n$ then in Proposition 2.7 C', C'' are uniquely determined by $\lambda_{[v,w]}$, not merely uniquely up to translations. Moreover, $\inf C' = \inf C'' = 0$.

Indeed, $C', C'' \in [0, \infty)^n$ is equivalent to $\inf C', \inf C'' \geq 0$ and since $\inf C' + \inf C'' = \inf C = 0$ it is equivalent to $\inf C' = \inf C'' = 0$. If $C = C' + C''$ is an arbitrary decomposition then all the other decompositions corresponding to the same $\lambda_{[v,w]}$'s are $C = C'_1 + C''_1$ with $C'_1 = C' + \beta$, $C''_1 = C'' - \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\inf C'_1 = \inf C' + \beta$ and $\inf C''_1 = \inf C'' - \beta$. Since $\inf C' + \inf C'' = 0$ the only value of β such that $\inf C'_1 = \inf C''_1 = 0$ is $\beta = -\inf C'$.

Also since $\inf \lambda C = \inf(1 - \lambda)C = 0$ in Proposition 2.7(ii) and Corollary 2.8 we replace the statement that $C' = \lambda C + \beta$ and $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C - \beta$ by $C' = \lambda C$, $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C$.

2.12. Integral polytopes. We say that a polytope is integral if all its vertices have integer coordinates. We are interested in decompositions $C = C' + C''$, where both C', C'' are integral polytopes. Then in Proposition 2.7 $\lambda_{[v,w]}$ should satisfy the condition $\lambda_{[v,w]}(w - v) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. This is because $\phi(w) - \phi(v) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. (We have $\phi(v), \phi(w) \in \mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$.) The values of $\lambda_{[v,w]} \in [0, 1]$ satisfying this condition are precisely $\lambda_{[v,w]} = \frac{\alpha}{d}$, where d is the gcd of the coordinates of $w - v$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq d$.

³With different notations, this result seems to appear in [KM, §4]. It might be older though.

Newton polytopes.

Definition 4. If $P \in K[X] \setminus \{0\}$ we define the Newton polytope of P as $C(P) := \text{conv } I(P)$.

2.13. Since $C(P) = \text{conv } I(P)$ we have $\mathcal{V}(C(P)) \subseteq I(P) \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ so $C(P)$ is an integral polytope. We also have $\inf C(P) = \inf I(P) \geq 0$. More precicely $\inf C(P) = \inf I(P)$ is defined by the property that $X^{-\inf C(P)}P$ is a polynomial not divisible by X_t for any t .

Also since $\deg X^i = \sum i = \langle i, \sum_{t=1}^n e_t \rangle$ we have

$$\deg P = \max \langle I(P), \sum_{t=1}^n e_t \rangle = \max \langle C(P), \sum_{t=1}^n e_t \rangle.$$

(Same as for the minimum, we have $\max \langle \text{conv } X, a \rangle = \max \langle X, a \rangle$.)

The most important property of the Newton polytope is the following result first noticed by Ostrowski

Theorem 2.14. (Ostrowski 1921) If $P, Q \in K[X] \setminus \{0\}$ then $C(PQ) = C(P) + C(Q)$.

Proof. Let $C = C(P) + C(Q)$. We have $C = \text{conv}(I(P) + I(Q))$. Since $I(PQ) \subseteq I(P) + I(Q)$ we have $C(PQ) \subseteq C$. For the reverse inclusion it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{V}(C) \subseteq C(P) + C(Q)$. Let $P = \sum_{i \in I(P)} a_i X^i$, $Q = \sum_{i \in I(Q)} b_i X^i$ with $a_i, b_i \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.4(ii) every $v \in \mathcal{V}(C)$ can be written uniquely as $v = x + y$ with $x \in C(P)$, $y \in C(Q)$, namely $v = \phi(v) + \psi(v)$ with $\phi(v) \in \mathcal{V}(C(P))$, $\psi(v) \in \mathcal{V}(C(Q))$. Since $\mathcal{V}(C(P)) \subseteq I(P) \subseteq C(P)$ and $\mathcal{V}(C(Q)) \subseteq I(Q) \subseteq C(Q)$ the coefficient of X^v in PQ is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in I(P), j \in I(Q) \\ i+j=v}} a_i b_j = a_{\phi(v)} b_{\psi(v)} \neq 0.$$

Hence $v \in I(PQ)$. $\square$

3. PROOF OF THE SECOND IMPLICATION

We say that a finite nonempty set $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ is good if $Z_I = V_I$. We want to prove that if I is good then it satisfies one of the conditions (i)-(iii) of the main theorem. We assume the contrary.

Let $C = \text{conv } I$. Then $C(P) = C$ for any $P \in V_I$.

The case $\dim C = 0$. In this case $I = C$ is a singleton, $I = \{i\}$ and $V_I = \{aX^i \mid a \in K^*\}$. Hence $Z_I = V_I$ implies $i \neq 0$ and $i \neq e_t \forall k$. (Otherwise every $P \in V_I$ is a constant or of the form aX_t so it is irreducible.) Let $i = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ and let t be an index such that $i_t \neq 0$. Then $I = \{i\} \subset e_t + \mathbb{N}^n$ and $I \neq \{e_t\}$ so I satisfies (i). $\square$

From now on we assume that $\dim C > 0$ so I is not a singleton. We claim that $\inf C = \inf I = 0$. Otherwise if $\inf I = i = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \neq 0$ then there is some t such that $i_t > 0$. It follows that $I \subset e_t + \mathbb{N}^n$ and $I \neq \{e_t\}$ so I satisfies (i).

Lemma 3.1. *If I is good and $\inf C = 0$ then there is a decomposition $C = C' + C''$, where C', C'' are integral polytopes of dimension > 0 and $\inf C' = \inf C'' = 0$ such that W_I is contained in the image of $\mu_{C' \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C'' \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} : W_{C' \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \times W_{C'' \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \rightarrow W_{C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$.*

Proof. There is a finite number of ways one can write $C = C' + C''$, where C', C'' are integral polytopes and $\inf C' = \inf C'' = 0$. It is because by Proposition 2.7 and Remark 2.11 each such pair (C', C'') is uniquely determined by $\lambda_{[v, w]}$ with $[v, w] \in \mathcal{V}(C)$ and by 2.12 there is a finite number of possible values for each $\lambda_{[v, w]}$. Let $(C'_1, C''_1), \dots, (C'_N, C''_N)$ be all such pairs for which also $\dim C', \dim C'' > 0$.

Let $P \in V_I = Z_I$. Then $P = QR$, where $Q, R \in K[X]$ are not constants. Since $\inf C(P) = \inf C = 0$ $X_t \nmid P \forall t$ so Q, R cannot be monomials. Therefore $|I(Q)|, |I(R)| \geq 2$ so $\dim C(Q), \dim C(R) > 0$. Since $C(Q) + C(R) = C(P) = C$ we have $(C(Q), C(R)) = (C'_\alpha, C''_\alpha)$ for some α .

We have $I(Q) \subseteq C(Q) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, $I(R) \subseteq C(R) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. Since $(C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) + (C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) \subseteq (C'_\alpha + C''_\alpha) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ the product function $\mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} : W_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \times W_{C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \rightarrow W_{C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ is defined and $P = QR \in \text{Im } \mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$. In conclusion $V_I \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^N \text{Im } \mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \subseteq W_{C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$. Since $\text{Im } \mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ are closed in $W_{C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ and V_I is a affine variety so it is connected in the Zariski topology we have $V_i \subseteq \text{Im } \mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ for some α . By Lemma 1.1 $\text{Im } \mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ is closed in $W_{C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ and the closure of V_I in $W_{C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$ is W_I so $W_i \subseteq \text{Im } \mu_{C'_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, C''_\alpha \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$. Thus our statement holds for $(C', C'') = (C'_\alpha, C''_\alpha)$. $\square$

3.2. If C', C'' are the convex sets from Lemma 3.1 we may use the notations from §2. Let $\phi = \phi_{C', C''} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$, $\psi = \psi_{C', C''} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}''$ and let $\lambda_{[v, w]}$ for $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ be defined as in Lemma 2.6.

By Proposition 2.7(iii) since neither C' nor C'' is a singleton the numbers $\lambda_{[v,w]}$, $[v,w] \in \mathcal{F}_1$, cannot be all 0 or all 1.

The case $\dim C = 1$. In this case we have $C = [i, j]$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and we have $\{i, j\} = \mathcal{V}(C) \subseteq I$ and $I \subset C = [i, j]$. Let $i = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$, $j = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$. Since $0 = \inf C = \inf\{i, j\}$ ($C = \text{conv}\{i, j\}$) we have $i_t j_t = 0 \forall t$.

By 2.12 we have $\lambda_{[i,j]} = \frac{\alpha}{d}$ with $0 \leq \alpha \leq d$, where $d = \gcd\{j_1 - i_1, \dots, j_n - i_n\}$. Since $[i, j]$ is the only edge of C we have by 3.2 $0 < \lambda_{[i,j]} < 1$ so $0 < \alpha < d$, which implies that $d > 1$. But $i_t j_t = 0 \forall t$ so $\gcd\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\} = \gcd\{j_1 - i_1, \dots, j_n - i_n\} = d > 1$.

Since also $i, j \in I \subseteq [i, j]$ I satisfies (ii). $\square$

Before proving the case $\dim C \geq 2$ we need two more Lemmas.

Lemma 3.3. (i) *With the notations from 3.2, we have $\lambda_{[i,j]} = \lambda \forall [i, j] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ for some $0 < \lambda < 1$. Hence $C' = \lambda C$, $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C$.*

(ii) *If $[i, j] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $\{i, j\} \subseteq J \subseteq I$ then $J - \inf J$ is a good set.*

Proof. First note that if $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $i \in J \subseteq I$ then i is also a vertex of $\text{conv } J$. Indeed, we have $\{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ so there is $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\{i\} = C_a$ i.e. $\langle i, a \rangle < \langle x, a \rangle$ for any $x \in C \setminus \{i\}$. Since $i \in \text{conv } J \subseteq \text{conv } I = C$ we have $\langle i, a \rangle < \langle x, a \rangle$ for any $x \in \text{conv } J \setminus \{i\}$ so $\{i\} = (\text{conv } J)_a$ so i is a vertex of $\text{conv } J$.

Assume now that $P \in V_J$. Then $P \in W_I \subseteq \text{Im } \mu_{C' \cup \mathbb{Z}^n, C'' \cup \mathbb{Z}^n}$ so there are $Q \in W_{C' \cup \mathbb{Z}^n}$, $R \in W_{C'' \cup \mathbb{Z}^n}$ such that $P = QR$. If $C_1 = C(P) = \text{conv } J$, $C'_1 = C(Q)$ and $C''_1 = C(R)$ then $C_1 = C'_1 + C''_1$ and we denote by $\phi' = \phi_{C'_1, C'_1} : \mathcal{V}(C_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(C'_1)$, $\psi' = \psi_{C'_1, C''_1} : \mathcal{V}(C_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(C''_1)$ and $\lambda'_{[v,w]}$ for $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1(C_1)$ the ϕ, ψ and $\lambda_{[v,w]}$ corresponding to C_1, C'_1, C''_1 . Now $I(P) \subseteq I$ so $C_1 \subseteq C$, $I(Q) \subseteq C'$ so $C'_1 \subseteq C'$ and $I(R) \subseteq C''$ so $C''_1 \subseteq C''$. We have $i \in \mathcal{V}(C_1)$ so the only way of writing $i = x + y$ with $x \in C'_1$, $y \in C''_1$ is $i = \phi'(x) + \psi'(y)$. On the other hand $i \in \mathcal{V}$ so the only way of writing $i = x + y$ with $x \in C'$, $y \in C''$ is $i = \phi(x) + \psi(y)$. Thus $\phi'(i) = \phi(i)$ and $\psi'(i) = \psi(i)$.

After this introduction we start the proof of our lemma.

(i) Consider first two edges of C that meet in the same vertex, $[i, j], [j, k] \in \mathcal{F}_1$. Take $J = \{i, j, k\}$ and construct $C_1, C'_1, C''_1, \phi', \psi'$ and $\lambda'_{[v,w]}$ for $[v, w] \in \mathcal{F}_1(C_1)$ as above. Now $C_1 = \text{conv } J$ is the triangle $[i, j, k]$ so by Proposition 2.7(ii) and Corollary 2.8 we have $\lambda'_{[i,j]} = \lambda'_{[j,k]} = \lambda'_{[k,i]}$. But $i, j, k \in \mathcal{V}$ so $\phi'(i) = \phi(i)$, $\phi'(j) = \phi(j)$, $\phi'(k) = \phi(k)$. Thus $\lambda'_{[i,j]}(j-i) = \phi'(j) - \phi'(i) = \phi(j) - \phi(i) = \lambda_{[i,j]}(j-i)$ so $\lambda'_{[i,j]} = \lambda_{[i,j]}$. Similarly $\lambda'_{[j,k]} = \lambda_{[j,k]}$ so $\lambda_{[i,j]} = \lambda_{[j,k]}$.

Let now $[i, j], [i', j'] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ be arbitrary. Then there is a path between j and i' along the edges of C , $i_1 = j, i_2, \dots, i_N = i'$. Then $\lambda_{[i, i_1]} = \lambda_{[i_1, i_2]} = \dots = \lambda_{[i_{N-1}, i_N]} = \lambda_{[i_N, j']}$ so $\lambda_{[i, j]} = \lambda_{[i', j']}$.

Let λ be the common value of all $\lambda_{[i, j]}$. By 3.2 $\lambda \neq 0, 1$ so $0 < \lambda < 1$.

(ii) Note that $\inf(J - \inf J) = \inf J - \inf J = 0$ so $J - \inf J \subset \mathbb{N}^n$. Let $\overline{P} \in V_{J - \inf J}$ and let $P = X^{\inf J} \overline{P}$. Then $P \in V_J$. We then decompose $P = QR$ as above. Since $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ and $i, j \in J$ we have $i, j \in \mathcal{V}(C_1)$ and $\phi'(i) = \phi(i)$, $\psi'(i) = \psi(i)$, $\phi'(j) = \phi(j)$, $\psi'(j) = \psi(j)$. By (i) $\lambda_{[i, j]} = \lambda \neq 0, 1$ so $\phi(j) - \phi(i) = \lambda(j - i) \neq 0$ and $\psi(j) - \psi(i) = (1 - \lambda)(j - i) \neq 0$. Hence $\phi'(i) \neq \phi'(j)$ and $\psi'(i) \neq \psi'(j)$. Since $\phi'(i), \phi'(j) \in C'_1$ and $\psi'(i), \psi'(j) \in C'_1$ neither $C'_1 = C(Q)$, nor $C''_1 = C(R)$ is a singleton so neither Q , nor R is a monomial. Since $X^{\inf J} \overline{P} = P$ is the product of two polynomials, neither of which is a monomial, we have that $\overline{P}$ is decomposable so $\overline{P} \in Z_{J - \inf J}$. Hence $Z_{J - \inf J} = V_{J - \inf J}$, i.e. $J - \inf J$ is good. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}^n$ be noncolinear and let $I = \{i, j, k\}$. Assume that $\inf I = 0$. Then $Z_I = V_I$ if $\text{char } K = p$ and $I \subset p\mathbb{Z}^n$ for some prime p and $Z_I = \emptyset$ otherwise.*

Proof. The first statement follows trivially from the first section as I satisfies condition (iii) of the main theorem.

For the second statement let $P = a_i X^i + a_j X^j + a_k X^k$ where $a_i, a_j, a_k \in K^*$. Assume that $P \in Z_I$, i.e. P decomposes. We write $P = QR$, where $Q, R \in K[X]$ are not constants and Q is irreducible. If $C = C(P)$, $C' = C(Q)$ and $C'' = C(R)$ then $C = C' + C''$. Since C is a triangle with $\inf C = \inf I = 0$ and $C', C'' \subseteq [0, \infty)^n$ we have by Corollary 2.8 and 2.11 $C' = \lambda C$, $C'' = (1 - \lambda)C$ with $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Since Q, R are not constants we have $C', C'' \neq \{0\}$ so $\lambda \neq 0, 1$.

Let $Q = \sum_{h \in I(Q)} b_h X^h$ with $b_h \in K^*$. Now $C(Q) = C' = \lambda C$ is the triangle with vertices at $\lambda i, \lambda j, \lambda k$ so $\lambda i, \lambda j, \lambda k \in I(Q) \subset \mathbb{N}^n$. It follows that $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ and if we write $\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{d}$ with $(\alpha, d) = 1$ then $i, j, k \in d\mathbb{N}^n$, i.e. $I \subset d\mathbb{N}^n$. By hypothesis if $\text{char } K = p$ then $I \not\subset p\mathbb{N}^n$ so $p \nmid d$.

Before going further we prove that if $s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s_1 t_2 - s_2 t_1 \neq 0$ and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in K^*$ then the system $x^{s_1} y^{t_1} = \varepsilon_1$, $x^{s_2} y^{t_2} = \varepsilon_2$ has a solution with $x, y \in K^*$. If $t_2 \neq 0$ we note that for any $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ our system is equivalent to the system $x^{s_2} y^{t_2} = \varepsilon_2$, $x^{s_1} y^{t_1} (x^{s_2} y^{t_2})^{-q} = \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2^{-q}$. The second equation may be written as $x^{s_3} y^{t_3} = \varepsilon_3$, where $\varepsilon_3 = \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2^{-q}$, $s_3 = s_1 - q s_2$ and $t_3 = t_1 - q t_2$. We choose q such that $|t_3| < |t_2|$. Note that $s_2 t_3 - s_3 t_2 = -(s_1 t_2 - s_2 t_1) \neq 0$. We repeat the procedure and obtain new equivalent systems $x^{s_l} y^{t_l} = \varepsilon_l$, $x^{s_{l+1}} y^{t_{l+1}} = \varepsilon_{l+1}$ with $s_l t_{l+1} - s_{l+1} t_l \neq 0$ and $|t_2| > \dots > |t_{l+1}|$ until we get an index l with

$t_{l+1} = 0$. We have $0 \neq s_l t_{l+1} - s_{l+1} t_l = -s_{l+1} t_l$ so $s_{l+1}, t_l \neq 0$ and our system writes as $x^{s_l} y^{t_l} = \varepsilon_l$, $x^{s_{l+1}} = \varepsilon_{l+1}$, which obviously has solutions. (Take x with $x^{s_{l+1}} = \varepsilon_{l+1}$ and then take y with $y^{t_l} = \varepsilon_l x^{-s_l}$.)

Let now $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n), r = (r_1, \dots, r_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be linearly independent and let $\varepsilon, \eta \in K^*$. We claim that there is $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (K^*)^n$ such that $x^q = \varepsilon$, $x^r = \eta$.

Since the $2 \times n$ matrix $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ r \end{pmatrix}$ has rank 2 there are $1 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq n$ such that $q_\alpha r_\beta - q_\beta r_\alpha \neq 0$. Then as seen above there are $x, y \in K^*$ such that $x^{q_\alpha} y^{q_\beta} = \varepsilon$ and $x^{r_\alpha} y^{r_\beta} = \eta$. Then we simply take $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with $x_\alpha = x$, $x_\beta = y$ and $x_t = 1$ for $t \neq \alpha, \beta$ and we have $x^q = \varepsilon$, $x^r = \eta$.

We now continue our proof. Since $\frac{1}{d}(j-i)$ and $\frac{1}{d}(k-i)$ are linearly independent for any $\varepsilon, \eta \in \mu_d$ there is $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta) = (\gamma_1(\varepsilon, \eta), \dots, \gamma_n(\varepsilon, \eta)) \in (K^*)^n$ such that $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\frac{1}{d}(j-i)} = \varepsilon$, $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\frac{1}{d}(k-i)} = \eta$. We define $P_{\varepsilon, \eta} := P(\gamma_1(\varepsilon, \eta)X_1, \dots, \gamma_n(\varepsilon, \eta)X_n)$ and $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} := Q(\gamma_1(\varepsilon, \eta)X_1, \dots, \gamma_n(\varepsilon, \eta)X_n)$. Since $Q \mid P$ we have $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \mid P_{\varepsilon, \eta}$ and since Q is irreducible so is $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta}$.

For any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ we have $(\gamma_1(\varepsilon, \eta)X_1, \dots, \gamma_n(\varepsilon, \eta)X_n)^h = \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^h X^h$ so $P_{\varepsilon, \eta} = a_i \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^i X^i + a_j \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^j X^j + a_l \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^l X^l$ and $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \sum_{h \in I(Q)} b_h \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^h X^h$.

Note that $P_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^i (a_i X^i + a_j \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{j-i} X^j + a_l \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{l-i} X^l)$. But $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{j-i} = \varepsilon^d = 1$ and $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{l-i} = \eta^d = 1$ so $P_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^i P \sim P$. (Here by $\sim$ we mean that the two polynomials are associates in $K[X]$.) Since $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \mid P_{\varepsilon, \eta}$ we have $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \mid P \forall \varepsilon, \eta \in \mu_d$. Assume now that $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \sim Q_{\varepsilon', \eta'}$ so $Q_{\varepsilon', \eta'} = t Q_{\varepsilon, \eta}$ for some $t \in K^*$. We have $\lambda i, \lambda j, \lambda k \in I(Q)$ and by considering the coefficients of $X^{\lambda i}, X^{\lambda j}, X^{\lambda k}$ we get $t = \frac{b_i \gamma(\varepsilon', \eta')^{\lambda i}}{b_i \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\lambda i}} = \frac{b_j \gamma(\varepsilon', \eta')^{\lambda j}}{b_j \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\lambda j}} = \frac{b_l \gamma(\varepsilon', \eta')^{\lambda k}}{b_l \gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\lambda k}}$. It follows that $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\lambda(j-i)} = \gamma(\varepsilon', \eta')^{\lambda(j-i)}$ and $\gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)^{\lambda(k-i)} = \gamma(\varepsilon', \eta')^{\lambda(k-i)}$ so $\varepsilon^\alpha = \varepsilon'^\alpha$ and $\eta^\alpha = \eta'^\alpha$. (Recall, $\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{d}$.) But $\varepsilon, \varepsilon', \eta, \eta' \in \mu_d$ and $(\alpha, d) = 1$ so $\varepsilon = \varepsilon'$ and $\eta = \eta'$. Since $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \mid P \forall \varepsilon, \eta \in \mu_d$ and $Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \not\sim Q_{\varepsilon', \eta'}$ if $(\varepsilon, \eta) \neq (\varepsilon', \eta')$ we have $\prod_{\varepsilon, \eta \in \mu_d} Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} \mid P$. It follows that $\deg P \geq \deg \prod_{\varepsilon, \eta \in \mu_d} Q_{\varepsilon, \eta} = |\mu_d|^2 \deg Q$. But $C(P) = C$ and $C(Q) = \lambda C$ so by 2.13 $\deg P = \max\langle C, \sum_{t=1}^n e_t \rangle$ and $\deg Q = \max\langle \lambda C, \sum_{t=1}^n e_t \rangle = \lambda \deg P \geq \frac{1}{d} \deg P$. Since $\text{char } K \nmid d$ we also have $|\mu_d| = |\mu_d(K)| = d$ so $|\mu_d|^2 \deg Q \geq d^2 \cdot \frac{1}{d} \deg P = d \deg P > \deg P$. Contradiction. Hence P is irreducible $\forall P \in V_I$, i.e. $Z_I = \emptyset$. $\square$

The case $\dim C \geq 2$. We will prove that I satisfies condition (iii) of the main theorem, i.e. that $\text{char } K = p$ and $I \subset p\mathbb{N}^n$ for some prime p . In fact we only have to prove that all elements of I are $\equiv \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}^n}$. Indeed, this implies that for any index t the t -th coordinates of all elements of I are $\equiv \pmod{p}$. But $\inf I = 0$ so at least one of these

t -th coordinates is 0. Hence all t -th coordinates are divisible by p . So $I \subseteq p\mathbb{N}^n$.

Let $i \in \mathcal{V}$. We will show that for any $k \in I$, $k \neq i$ we have $\text{char } K = p$ and $i \equiv k \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}^n}$ for some prime p . Let $[i, j], [i, j'] \in \mathcal{F}_1$ be two different edges emerging from i . Since $k \notin [i, j] \cap [i, j'] = \{i\}$ we may assume that, say, $k \notin [i, j]$. Since $k \in C$ this implies that k is not colinear with i, j . We use Lemma 3.3(ii) with $J = \{i, j, k\}$. If $h = \inf J$ then $J - h = \{i - h, j - h, k - h\}$ is a good set, i.e. $Z_{J-h} = V_{J-h}$ and we have $\inf(J - h) = h - h = 0$. Since $i - h, j - h, k - h$ are not colinear we use Lemma 3.3 and we have $\text{char } K = p$ and $J - h \subset p\mathbb{N}^n$ for some prime p . Since $i - h, k - h \in p\mathbb{N}^n$ we get $i \equiv k \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}^n}$. $\square$

4. IDECOMPOSABILITY AND CHARACTERISTIC

From Theorem 1.3 we see that if $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ is a finite nonempty set then $Z_I = V_I$ holds either for every field K , if (i) or (ii) holds, or only for fields with $\text{char } K \in S$, where S is a finite, possibly empty set of primes depending on I , otherwise. More precisely, if I doesn't satisfy (i) or (ii) then $S = \emptyset$ if $I = \{0\}$ and $S = \{p \mid I \subset p\mathbb{N}^n\}$, otherwise.

As we mentioned in §1, given a finite nonempty set $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$, the question if $Z_I = \emptyset$ doesn't seem to have a simple answer and we will not attempt to solve this problem. We will prove however that, same as for the question if $Z_I = V_I$, the answer depends on the characteristic we show the nature of this dependence.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ be finite and nonempty. Then there is a finite, possibly empty, set of primes S satisfying one of the following.*

- (a) $Z_I = \emptyset$ iff $\text{char } K \in S$.
- (b) $Z_I = \emptyset$ iff $\text{char } K \notin S$.

Proof. We use the notation from the proof of Proposition 1.2. The proof relies on Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. For every $P \in V_I$ we have $\deg P = d := \max\{\sum i \mid i \in I\}$. Such a polynomial is decomposable iff there are Q, R of degree $\leq d - 1$ with $QR = P$. Polynomials Q, R may be written as $Q = \sum_{i \in I_{d-1}} a_i X^i$, $R = \sum_{j \in I_{d-1}} b_j X^j$ and we have $P = \sum_{k \in I_{2d-2}} c_k X^k$ where $c_k = \sum_{i, j \in I_{d-1}, i+j=k} a_i b_j$. The condition that $P \in V_I$, i.e. $I(P) = I$ means $c_k \neq 0$ if $k \in I$ and $c_k = 0$ if $k \in I_{2d-2} \setminus I$. Hence $Z_I \neq \emptyset$, i.e. V_I contains decomposable polynomials iff there are $a = (a_i)_{i \in I_{d-1}}, b = (b_i)_{i \in I_{d-1}} \in K^{I_{d-1}}$ such that $c_k \neq 0$ if $k \in I$ and $c_k = 0$ if $k \in I_{2d-2} \setminus I$.

Let $A = (A_i)_{i \in I_{d-1}}$ and $B = (B_j)_{j \in I_{d-1}}$ be multivariables. For any $k \in I_{2d-2}$ we consider the polynomial $f_k \in K[A, B]$, $f_k = \sum_{i, j \in I_{d-1}, i+j=k} A_i B_j$.

Then c_k above can be written as $c_k = f_k(a, b)$. Hence $Z_I \neq \emptyset$ iff there are $a, b \in K^{I_{d-1}}$ such that $f_k(a, b) \neq 0$ if $k \in I$, $f_k(a, b) = 0$ if $k \in I_{2d-2} \setminus I$. Equivalently, $Z_I = \emptyset$ iff for any $a, b \in K^{I_{d-1}}$ such that $f_k(a, b) = 0 \forall k \in I_{2d-2} \setminus I$ we have $\prod_{k \in I} f_k(a, b) = 0$. By Nullstellensatz there is some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and there are $g_k \in K[A, B]$ for $k \in I_{2d-2} \setminus I$ such that

$$\left(\prod_{k \in I} f_k\right)^N = \sum_{k \in I_{2d-2} \setminus I} f_k g_k.$$

Moreover, by the effective Nullstellensatz N and an upper bound D for the degrees of g_k can be found in terms of I alone. Then the equation above is equivalent to a linear system where the unknowns are the coefficients of the g_k 's. Since all f_k 's have integer coefficients the augmented matrix of the system has integer entries. Let $U \in M_{q,r}(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\overline{U} \in M_{q,r+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ be the matrix and the augmented matrix and let $\delta = \text{rank } \overline{U} - \text{rank } U \in \{0, 1\}$. For a given field K the matrix and the augmented matrix are $U(K)$ and $\overline{U}(K)$, the images of U and $\overline{U}$ in $M_{q,r}(K)$ and $M_{q,r+1}(K)$. Let $\delta(K) = \text{rank } \overline{U}(K) - \text{rank } U(K)$. If $\delta(U) = 0$ then the system is compatible and so $Z_I = \emptyset$, while if $\delta(K) = 1$ it is incompatible so $Z_I \neq \emptyset$. But $U(K)$ and $\overline{U}(K)$ and so $\delta(K)$ only depend on the characteristic κ of K so we will denote them by $U_\kappa, \overline{U}_\kappa, \delta_\kappa$. If $\kappa = 0$ then $U_0 = U$ and $\overline{U}_0 = \overline{U}$ so $\delta_0 = \delta$. If $\kappa = p > 0$ then U_p and $\overline{U}_p$ are the images of U and $\overline{U}$ in $M_{q,r}(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ and $M_{q,r+1}(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ and $\delta_p = \text{rank } \overline{U}_p - \text{rank } U_p$. For almost all p we have $\text{rank } U_p = \text{rank } U$ and $\text{rank } \overline{U}_p = \text{rank } \overline{U}$ so $\delta_p = \delta$. We denote by S the finite set of all primes p with $\delta_p \neq \delta$. Then we have either $\delta_\kappa = 0$ if $\kappa \in S$ and $\delta_\kappa = 1$ if $\kappa \notin S$, so (a) holds, or $\delta_\kappa = 1$ if $\kappa \in S$ and $\delta_\kappa = 0$ if $\kappa \notin S$, so (b) holds. $\square$

Theorem 4.2. *For any finite set of primes S each of the cases (a) and (b) of Theorem 4.1 can be obtained for some I .*

Proof. For (b) we use Lemma 3.4. Let $d = \prod_{p \in S} p$. We define $I = \{(0, 0), (d, 0), (0, d)\} \subset \mathbb{N}^2$. Since the three points are not colinear and $\inf I = 0$ Lemma 3.4 applies. The only primes p with $I \subset p\mathbb{N}^2$ are precisely those in S . So by Lemma 3.4 $Z_I = V_I \neq \emptyset$ if $p \in S$ and $Z_I = \emptyset$ otherwise. Hence (b) holds.

If we take, say, $I = \{1, 2\}$ then $Z_I = V_I \neq \emptyset$ regardless of the characteristic of K so (a) holds with $S = \emptyset$. However constructing sets I satisfying (a) for $S \neq \emptyset$ is more difficult and requires some preliminary results.

If $I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ is finite and nonempty and K is an algebraically closed field we denote by $A(I, K)$ the statement $Z_I(K) = \emptyset$. If $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ are finite and nonempty denote by $B(I', I'', I, K)$ the statement: There are no $P, Q \in K[X]$ with $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$, $I(PQ) = I$.

Lemma 4.3. *If $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ are finite and nonempty and K is an algebraically closed field then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ is equivalent to $A(J, K)$, where $J \subset \mathbb{N}^{n+2}$,*

$$J = (I \times \{(0, 0)\}) \cup (I' \times \{(0, 1)\}) \cup (I'' \times \{(1, 0)\}) \cup \{(0, \dots, 0, 1, 1)\}.$$

Proof. We introduce two more variables, $X_{n+1} = Y$ and $X_{n+2} = Z$.

If $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails then let $P, Q \in K[X]$ with $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$, $I(PQ) = I$. Then $I((P+Y)(Q+Z)) = I(PQ + PZ + QY + YZ) = (I(PQ) \times \{(0, 0)\}) \cup (I(P) \times \{(0, 1)\}) \cup (I(Q) \times \{(1, 0)\}) \cup \{(0, \dots, 0, 1, 1)\} = J$. Hence $(P+Y)(Q+Z) \in Z_J(K)$ so $A(J, K)$ fails.

Conversely, if $A(J, K)$ fails let $F \in Z_J(K)$. We have $I(F) = J$ so $F = R + PZ + QY + YZ$ for some $P, Q, R \in K[X]$ with $I(R) = I$, $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$. Now F is decomposable as $F = GH$, with $G, H \in K[X, Y, Z] \setminus K$. By considering the degrees in Y and Z and the coefficient of YZ one shows that, up to permutation and multiplication by constants, we have $G = P' + Y$, $H = Q' + Z$ with $P', Q' \in K[X]$. From $R + PZ + QY + YZ = (P' + Y)(Q' + Z)$ one gets $P = P'$, $Q = Q'$ and $R = P'Q'$ so $R = PQ$. Since $I(P) = I(P') = I'$, $I(Q) = I(Q') = I''$ and $I(PQ) = I(R) = I$ $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. We define $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}^3$ as follows.*

$$I' = (\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times \{0, 1\} \times \{1\}),$$

$$I'' = \{0, \dots, d\} \times \{0, 1\} \times \{0\}$$

and

$$I = (I' + I'') \setminus (\{1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, 2\} \times \{0\}) \setminus \{(0, 1, 1), (d, 1, 1)\}.$$

Then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ holds if and only if $\text{char } K \mid d$.

Proof. We have

$$I' + I'' = (\{0, \dots, d+1\} \times \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0, \dots, d\} \times \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{1\}).$$

We denote $(X_1, X_2, X_3) = (X, Y, Z)$.

If $P, Q \in K[X, Y, Z]$ with $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$ then $P = P_0 + P_1Z$, where

$$P_0 = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{j=0}^1 a_{i,j} X^i Y^j \text{ and } P_1 = a'_0 + a'_1 Y$$

and

$$Q = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^1 b_{i,j} X^i Y^j,$$

where all $a_{i,j}$, a'_j , $b_{i,j}$ belong to K^* .

Since $I(PQ) \subseteq I' + I''$ we have $PQ = R_0 + R_1 Z$, where

$$R_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \sum_{j=0}^2 c_{i,j} X^i Y^j \text{ and } R_1 = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^2 c'_{i,j} X^i Y^j.$$

Since $(P_0 + P_1 Z)Q = R_0 + R_1 Z$ we have $P_0 Q = R_0$ so

$$(a_{0,0} + a_{1,0} X) \sum_{i=0}^d b_{i,0} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,0} X^i, \quad (a_{0,1} + a_{1,1} X) \sum_{i=0}^d b_{i,1} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,2} X^i$$

$$\text{and } (a_{0,0} + a_{1,0} X) \sum_{i=0}^d b_{i,1} X^i + (a_{0,1} + a_{1,1} X) \sum_{i=0}^d b_{i,0} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,1} X^i$$

and $P_1 Q = R_1$ so

$$(a'_0 + a'_1 Y)(b_{i,0} + b_{i,1} Y) = c'_{i,0} + c'_{i,1} Y + c'_{i,2} Y^2 \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq d.$$

Suppose now that $\text{char } K = p \mid d$ and $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails so there are $P, Q \in K[X, Y, Z]$ with $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$ and $I(PQ) = I$. We have $d = p^t d'$ with $t > 0$ and $p \nmid d'$. Using the above notations the condition that $I(PQ) = I$ means $c_{1,j} = \dots = c_{d,j} = 0$ for $j = 0, 2$, $c'_{0,1} = c'_{d,1} = 0$ and all other $c_{i,j}$ and $c'_{i,j}$ are $\neq 0$.

We have $(a_{0,0} + a_{1,0} X) \sum_{i=0}^d b_{i,0} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,0} X^i = c_{0,0} + c_{d+1,0} X^{d+1}$ so $a_{1,0} = -\alpha a_{0,0}$ and $b_{i,0} = \alpha^i b_{0,0}$ for $0 \leq i \leq d$ for some $\alpha \in K^*$. Similarly $(a_{0,1} + a_{1,1} X) \sum_{i=0}^d b_{i,1} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,2} X^i = c_{0,2} + c_{d+1,2} X^{d+1}$ so $a_{1,1} = -\beta a_{0,1}$ and $b_{i,1} = \beta^i b_{0,1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq d$ for some $\beta \in K^*$.

We have $(a'_0 + a'_1 Y)(b_{0,0} + b_{0,1} Y) = c'_{0,0} + c'_{0,1} Y + c'_{0,2} Y^2 = c'_{0,0} + c'_{0,2} Y^2$ so $\frac{a'_1}{a'_0} = -\frac{b_{0,1}}{b_{0,0}}$. Similarly $(a'_0 + a'_1 Y)(b_{d,0} + b_{d,1} Y) = c'_{d,0} + c'_{d,1} Y + c'_{d,2} Y^2 = c'_{d,0} + c'_{d,2} Y^2$ so $\frac{a'_1}{a'_0} = -\frac{b_{d,1}}{b_{d,0}} = -\frac{\beta^d b_{0,1}}{\alpha^d b_{0,0}}$. So $(\beta/\alpha)^d = 1$. Since $\text{char } K = p$ and $d = p^t d'$ this implies $(\beta/\alpha)^{d'} = 1$. It follows that $\frac{b_{d',1}}{b_{d',0}} = \frac{\beta^{d'} b_{0,1}}{\alpha^{d'} b_{0,0}} = \frac{b_{0,1}}{b_{0,0}} = -\frac{a'_1}{a'_0}$. Since $(a'_0 + a'_1 Y)(b_{d',0} + b_{d',1} Y) = c'_{d',0} + c'_{d',1} Y + c'_{d',2} Y^2$ we get $c'_{d',1} = 0$. Contradiction. ($c'_{i,1} = 0$ holds only for $i = 0, d$.)

Hence $B(I', I'', I, K)$ holds if $\text{char } K \nmid d$. We now prove that it fails otherwise. To do this we have to show that if $\text{char } K \nmid d$ there are $P, Q \in K[X, Y, Z]$ with $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$ and $I(PQ) = I$. We keep the above notation for the coefficients of P, Q, PQ . Since $\text{char } K \nmid d$ we have $|\mu_d(K)| = d$. Let ζ be a primitive d -th root of unity

in K and let $a \in K^*$ with $a \notin \mu_d \cup \{-1, -\zeta^{-1}\}$. We take $a_{0,0} = 1$, $a_{1,0} = -1$, $a_{0,1} = a$, $a_{1,1} = -a\zeta$, $a'_0 = 1$, $a'_1 = -1$ and $b_{i,j} = \zeta^{ij} \forall i, j$. So $P = 1 - X + a(1 - \zeta X)Y + (1 - Y)Z$ and $Q = \sum_{i=0}^d X^i + \sum_{i=0}^d \zeta^i X^i Y$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,0} X^i &= (1 - X) \sum_{i=0}^d X^i = 1 - X^{d+1}, \\ \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,2} X^i &= a(1 - \zeta X) \sum_{i=0}^d \zeta^i X^i = a(1 - \zeta X^{d+1}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d+1} c_{i,1} X^i = (1 - X) \sum_{i=0}^d \zeta^i X^i + a(1 - \zeta X) \sum_{i=0}^d X^i.$$

By the way a was chosen $c_{0,1} = 1 + a \neq 0$, $c_{d+1,1} = -1 - a\zeta \neq 0$ and for $1 \leq i \leq d$ we have $c_{i,1} = \zeta^i - \zeta^{i-1} + a(1 - \zeta) = (\zeta - 1)(\zeta^{i-1} - a) \neq 0$. Hence $c_{i,j} = 0$ iff $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $j = 0, 2$.

For $0 \leq i \leq d$ we have

$$c'_{i,0} + c'_{i,1}Y + c'_{i,2}Y^2 = (1 - Y)(1 + \zeta^i Y)$$

so $c_{i,0} = 1$, $c'_{i,1} = \zeta^i - 1$ and $c'_{i,2} = -\zeta^i$. It follows that $c'_{i,j} = 0$ iff $(i, j) \in \{(0, 1), (d, 1)\}$.

In conclusion, $I(PQ) = I$, as claimed. $\square$

End of proof for Theorem 4.2. If S is a finite set of primes, $S \neq \emptyset$ then let $d = \prod_{p \in S} p$. If $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}^3$ are the sets defined in Lemma 4.4 then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ holds iff $\text{char } K \mid d$, i.e. iff $\text{char } K \in S$. This implies that if $J \subset \mathbb{N}^5$ is defined like in Lemma 4.3 then $A(J, K)$ holds iff $\text{char } K \in S$ so J satisfies the case (a) of Theorem 4.1 for the finite set S . $\square$

The set J above is included in $\mathbb{N}^5$, $|J| = |I| + |I'| + |I''| + 1 = (4d + 7) + 6 + (2d + 2) + 1 = 6d + 16$ and $\max\{\sum i \mid i \in J\} = d + 3$. So the polynomials in are in 5 variables and of degree $d + 3$ and have $6d + 16$ monomials. We will show that one can reduce the number of variables to 2, at the expense of increasing the degree to $6d + 15$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ be finite nonempty with $I \subseteq I' + I''$. Let $\ell : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^m$ be a linear function such that $\ell|_{I' + I''}$ is injective and let $a', a'' \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that $a' + \ell(I'), a'' + \ell(I'') \subset \mathbb{N}^m$. Then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ is equivalent to $B(a' + \ell(I'), a'' + \ell(I''), a' + a'' + \ell(I), K)$.*

Proof. Let $Y = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$ so $K[Y] = K[X_1, \dots, X_m]$.

If $i, i' \in I'$ with $\ell(i) = \ell(i')$ then for any $j \in I''$ $\ell(i + j) = \ell(i' + j)$. Since $i + j, i' + j \in I' + I''$ this implies that $i + j = i' + j$ so $i = i'$. Thus $\ell|_{I'}$ is injective and similarly for $\ell|_{I''}$. Therefore we have the bijections $f' : W_{I'} \rightarrow W_{a'+\ell(I')}$, $f'' : W_{I''} \rightarrow W_{a''+\ell(I'')}$ and $f : W_{I'+I''} \rightarrow W_{a'+a''+\ell(I'+I'')}$, given by $\sum_{i \in I'} a_i X^i \mapsto \sum_{i \in I'} a_i Y^{a'+\ell(i)}$, $\sum_{j \in I''} b_j X^j \mapsto \sum_{j \in I''} b_j Y^{a''+\ell(j)}$, $\sum_{k \in I'+I''} c_k X^k \mapsto \sum_{k \in I'+I''} c_k Y^{a'+a''+\ell(k)}$. We have $f'(V_{I'}) = V_{a'+\ell(I')}$, $f''(V_{I''}) = V_{a''+\ell(I'')}$ and $f(V_I) = V_{a'+a''+\ell(I)}$.

If $P \in W_{I'}$, $Q \in W_{I''}$ then $PQ \in W_{I'+I''}$. If $P = \sum_{i \in I'} a_i X^i$, $Q = \sum_{j \in I''} b_j X^j$ and $PQ = \sum_{k \in I'+I''} c_k X^k$ then $c_k = \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j$, where the sum is taken over all $i \in I'$, $j \in I''$ with $i + j = k$.

Now $f'(P) \in W_{a'+\ell(I')}$, $f''(Q) \in W_{a''+\ell(I'')}$ so $f'(P)f''(Q) \in W_{a'+a''+\ell(I'+I'')}$ so $f'(P)f''(Q) = \sum_{k \in I'+I''} c'_k Y^{a'+a''+\ell(k)}$ for some $c'_k \in K$. This implies that for any $k \in I' + I''$ $c'_k = \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j$, where the sum is taken over all $i \in I'$, $j \in I''$ with $(a' + \ell(i)) + (a'' + \ell(j)) = a' + a'' + \ell(k)$. Since $i + j, k \in I' + I''$ this is equivalent to $i + j = k$. Hence $c'_k = c_k$ so $f'(P)f''(Q) = f(PQ)$.

Suppose now that $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails so there are $P \in V_{I'}$, $Q \in V_{I''}$ such that $PQ \in V_I$. Then $f'(P) \in V_{a'+\ell(I')}$, $f''(Q) \in V_{a''+\ell(I'')}$ and $f'(P)f''(Q) = f(PQ) \in V_{a'+a''+\ell(I)}$ so $B(a' + \ell(I'), a'' + \ell(I''), a' + a'' + \ell(I), K)$ fails.

Conversely if $B(a' + \ell(I'), a'' + \ell(I''), a' + a'' + \ell(I), K)$ fails then let $\overline{P} \in V_{a'+\ell(I')}$, $\overline{Q} \in V_{a''+\ell(I'')}$ such that $\overline{P}\overline{Q} \in V_{a'+a''+\ell(I)}$. Then $\overline{P} = f'(P)$ and $\overline{Q} = f''(Q)$ for some $P \in V_{I'}$, $Q \in V_{I''}$. Since $f(PQ) = f'(P)f''(Q) = \overline{P}\overline{Q} \in V_{a'+a''+\ell(I)}$ we have $PQ \in V_I$ so $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *If $I = \prod_{t=0}^s \{0, \dots, b_t - 1\}$, where $b_t \geq 2$ are integers and $\ell : \mathbb{Z}^{s+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is given by $(i_0, \dots, i_s) \mapsto i_0 + b_0 i_1 + b_0 b_1 i_2 + \dots + b_1 \dots b_{s-1} i_s$ then ℓ defines a bijection between I and $\{0, \dots, b_0 \dots b_{s-1} - 1\}$. In particular, $\ell|_I$ is injective.*

Proof. We use induction on s . For $s = 0$ our statement is trivial. Let now $s \geq 1$. Then $I = I' \times \{0, \dots, b_s - 1\}$, where $I' = \prod_{t=0}^{s-1} \{0, \dots, b_t - 1\}$. By the induction hypothesis the linear mapping $\ell' : \mathbb{Z}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by $(i_0, \dots, i_{s-1}) \mapsto i_0 + b_0 i_1 + b_0 b_1 i_2 + \dots + b_1 \dots b_{s-2} i_{s-1}$ defines a bijection between I' and $\{0, \dots, b_0 \dots b_{s-1} - 1\}$.

Now $I = \prod_{j=0}^{b_s-1} I' \times \{j\}$. But for any $i = (i', j) \in I' \times \{j\}$ we have $\ell(i) = \ell'(i') + b_0 \dots b_{s-1} j$ so ℓ defines a bijection between $I' \times \{j\}$ and $\{0, \dots, b_0 \dots b_{s-1} - 1\} + b_0 \dots b_{s-1} j = \{b_0 \dots b_{s-1} j, \dots, b_0 \dots b_{s-1} (j+1) -$

1}. Since $\coprod_{j=0}^{b_s-1} \{b_0 \cdots b_{s-1}j, \dots, b_0 \cdots b_{s-1}(j+1)-1\} = \{0, \dots, b_0 \cdots b_s - 1\}$ we get the desired result. $\square$

Note that if $b_0 = \dots = b_s = b$ then Lemma 4.6 amounts to writing numbers $\leq b^{s+1} - 1$ in base b . Also note that we have similar results if we permute the roles of the indices $0, \dots, s$.

4.7. We now consider the sets $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ from Lemma 4.4. Since $I' + I'' \subset \{0, \dots, d+1\} \times \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0, 1\}$ by Lemma 4.6 $\ell : \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by $(i, j, k) \mapsto 6i + j + 3k$ is injective on $I' + I''$. Since $\ell(I'), \ell(I'') \subset \mathbb{N}$ we may apply Lemma 4.5 with $a' = a'' = 0$. Hence the result from Lemma 4.4 remain true if we replace I', I'' and I by $\ell(I'), \ell(I'')$ and $\ell(I)$.

That is, if

$$I' = \{0, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7\},$$

$$I'' = \{6i \mid 0 \leq i \leq d\} \cup \{6i + 1 \mid 0 \leq i \leq d\},$$

$$I = \{0, 2, 6d+6, 6d+8\} \cup \{6i+1 \mid 0 \leq i \leq d+1\} \cup \{6i+3 \mid 0 \leq i \leq d\} \\ \cup \{6i+4 \mid 1 \leq i \leq d-1\} \cup \{6i+5 \mid 0 \leq i \leq d\}$$

then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ holds iff $\text{char } K \mid d$.

We have $\min I' = \min I'' = \min I = 0$, $\max I' = 7$, $\max I'' = 6d + 1$ and $\max I = 6d + 8$.

Since $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}$ by using Lemma 4.3 one can obtain a set $J \subset \mathbb{N}^3$ with $V_J(K) = \emptyset$ iff $\text{char } K \mid d$. The following lemma proves that in fact we can take $J \subset \mathbb{N}^2$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\min I' = \min I'' = \min I = 0$, $\max I' = g' > 0$, $\max I'' = g'' > 0$ and $\max I = g' + g''$. Let K be an algebraically closed field.*

(i) *If $h > g'$, $J_0 = h + I$, $J_1 = I' \cup (h + I'')$ and $J = (J_0 \times \{0\}) \cup (J_1 \times \{1\}) \cup \{(0, 2)\}$ then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ is equivalent to $A(J, K)$.*

(ii) *If $I \cup \{g'\} \neq I' \cup (g' + I'')$, $J_0 = g' + I$, $J_1 = I' \cup (g' + I'')$ or $I' \triangle (g' + I'')$ and $J = (J_0 \times \{0\}) \cup (J_1 \times \{1\}) \cup \{(0, 2)\}$ then $B(I', I'', I, K)$ is equivalent to $A(J, K)$.*

Proof. We denote $(X_1, X_2) = (X, Y)$.

We prove (i) and (ii) together. For (ii) we make the convention that $h = g'$ so in both cases $h \geq g'$. We have $\min I' = 0$, $\max I' = g'$, $\min(h + I'') = h$ and $\max(h + I'') = h + g''$. In the case of (i), when $g' < h$, we have $I' \cap (h + I'') = \emptyset$, $\min J_1 = 0$, $\max J_1 = g' + h$. Also $I' = J_1 \cap [0, g']$ and $h + I'' = J_1 \cap [h, h + g'']$. In the case of (ii), when $h = g'$, we have $I' \cap (g' + I'') = \{g'\}$ so $I' \triangle (g' + I'') = I' \cup (g' + I'') \setminus \{g'\}$. The relations $\min J_1 = 0$, $\max J_1 = g' + h = g' + g''$ are preserved, even

when $J_1 = I' \cup (g' + I'') \setminus \{g'\}$, since $g' \neq 0, g' + g''$. But this time $I' = (J_1 \cap [0, g' - 1]) \cup \{g'\}$ and $g' + I'' = \{g'\} \cup (J_1 \cap [g' + 1, g' + g''])$.

Assume that $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails so there are $P, Q \in K[X]$ with $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = I''$ and $I(PQ) = I$. We take $F = (\lambda P + Y)(X^h Q + Y) = \lambda X^h P Q + (\lambda P + X^h Q)Y + Y^2$ for some $\lambda \in K^*$. Then

$$I(F) = (I(\lambda X^h P Q) \times \{0\}) \cup (I(\lambda P + X^h Q) \times \{1\}) \cup \{(0, 2)\}.$$

We have $I(\lambda X^h P Q) = h + I = J_0$. In the case (i) since $I(\lambda P) = I'$ and $I(X^h Q) = h + I''$ are disjoint we have $I(\lambda P + X^h Q) = I' \cup (h + I'') = J_1$. In the case of (ii) we have $I(\lambda P) \cap I(X^h Q) = I' \cap (g' + I'') = \{g'\}$ so $I(\lambda P + X^h Q)$ equals $I' \cup (g' + I'') \setminus \{g'\} = I' \triangle (g' + I'')$ if the coefficients of $X^{g'}$ in λP and $X^{g'} Q$ cancel each other and it equals $I' \cup (g' + I'')$ otherwise. For suitable choices of $\lambda \in K^*$ each of the two cases can occur. In particular, λ can be chosen such that $I(\lambda P + X^{g'} Q) = J_1$. In conclusion, $I(F) = J$ and since F is decomposable we have $Z_J \neq \emptyset$ so $A(J, K)$ fails.

Conversely, assume that $A(J, K)$ fails so there is a decomposable $F \in K[X, Y]$ with $I(F) = J$. Then $F = R_0 + R_1 Y + Y^2$, where $R_0, R_1 \in K[X]$ with $I(R_0) = J_0$, $I(R_1) = J_1$. Since F is decomposable we have $F = (P + Y)(Q + Y)$ so $R_0 = PQ$, $R_1 = P + Q$ for some $P, Q \in K[X]$. We have $I(R_0) = h + I$ so $R_0 = X^h R'_0$, where $I(R'_0) = I$ so $X \nmid R'_0$ and $\deg R'_0 = g' + g''$. Since $I(R_1) = J_1$, $\min J_1 = 0$, $\max J_1 = h + g''$ we have $X \nmid R_1$ and $\deg J_1 = h + g''$. Now $X \nmid R_1 = P + Q$ so we may assume that $X \nmid P$. Since $PQ = R_0 = X^h R'_0$ we have $Q = X^h Q'$ for some $Q' \in K[X]$ and $PQ' = R'_0$. We will prove that $I(P) = I'$ and $I(Q) = h + I''$ so $I(Q') = I''$. Since also $I(PQ') = I(R'_0) = I$ we have that $B(I', I'', I, K)$ fails.

We prove that $\deg P < h + g''$. In the case of (i) this follows from $\deg P \leq \deg R'_0 = g' + g''$. In the case of (ii) assume that $\deg P = g' + g'' = h + g''$. Then $PQ' = R'_0$ implies that $Q' = \lambda$ so $Q = \lambda X^{g'}$ for some $\lambda \in K^*$. Since $\lambda P = R'_0$ we have $I(P) = I(R'_0) = I$. Since also $R_1 = P + Q = P + \lambda X^{g'}$ and $I(R_1) = J_1$ we get $I \cup \{g'\} = J_1 \cup \{g'\} = I' \cup (g' + I'')$, which contradicts the hypothesis. So in all cases $\deg P < h + g'' = \deg R_0 = \deg(P + Q)$. It follows that $\deg Q = h + g''$ so $\deg Q' = g''$, which, together with $\deg PQ' = \deg R'_0 = g' + g''$, implies $\deg P = g'$. Thus $\max I(P) = g'$, $\max I(Q') = g''$ and since $X \nmid R'_0 = PQ'$ we have $\min I(P) = \min I(Q') = 0$. Since $Q = X^h Q'$ we have $\min I(Q) = h$, $\max I(Q) = h + g''$.

We have $I(P + Q) = I(R_1) = J_1$. In the case of (i) we have $\min I(P) = 0$, $\max I(P) = g' < h = \min I(Q)$ and $\max I(Q) = h + g''$ so $I(P) = J_1 \cap [0, g']$, $I(Q) = J_1 \cap [h, h + g'']$. In the case of (ii) $\min I(P) = 0$, $\max I(P) = g' = \min I(Q)$ and $\max I(Q) = g' + g''$ so

$I(P) = (J_1 \cap [0, g' - 1]) \cup \{g'\}$, $I(Q) = \{g'\} \cup (J_1 \cap [g' + 1, g' + g''])$. In both cases $I(P) = I'$, $I(Q) = h + I''$, as claimed. $\square$

If $I', I'', I \subset \mathbb{N}$ are the sets defined in 4.7 we have $\min I' = \min I'' = \min I = 0$, $\max I' = 7$, $\max I'' = 6d + 1$ and $\max I = 6d + 8$ so we may apply Lemma 4.8 with $g' = 7$, $g'' = 6d + 1$. Since $2 \in I$ but $2 \notin I' \cup (7 + I'')$ we have $I \cup \{7\} \neq I' \cup (7 + I'')$ so we may apply Lemma 4.8(ii). We take $J_0 = 7 + I$, $J_1 = I' \triangle (7 + I'') = I' \cup (7 + I'') \setminus \{7\}$ and $J = (J_0 \times \{0\}) \cup (J_1 \times \{1\}) \cup \{(0, 2)\}$. By Lemma 4.8(ii) and 4.7 we have that $A(J, K)$ iff $B(I', I'', I, K)$ iff $\text{char } K \mid d$.

Note that $\max J_0 = 7 + \max I = 6d + 15$ and $\max J_1 = g' + g'' = 7 + (6d + 1) = 6d + 8$ so all polynomials in V_J have degree $6d + 15$. Also $|J_0| = |I| = 4d + 7$ and $|J_1| = |I'| + |7 + I''| - 2 = 6 + (2d + 2) - 2 = 2d + 6$ so $|J| = (4d + 7) + (2d + 6) + 1 = 6d + 14$ so all polynomials in V_J are sums of $6d + 14$ monomials.

REFERENCES

- Gao, Shuhong, *Absolute irreducibility of polynomials via Newton polytopes*, J. Algebra 237, No.2, 501-520 (2001).
 Kesh, Deepanjan & Mehta, S. K., *Polynomial Irreducibility Testing through Minkowski Summand Computation*, 20th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG'08), McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 13-15 August 2008.

Institute of Mathematics "Simion Stoilow" of the Romanian Academy
 P.O. Box 1-764, RO-70700 Bucharest, Romania
 Email: Constantin.Beli@imar.ro raspopitu1@yahoo.com